

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 14, 2003. Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 12 which are the independent claims, have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention, in terms that distinguish it over the art of record. Applicant notes that Claims 2, 5, 7, and 10 have been amended as to matters of form only and those amendments do not, in any way, narrow the scope of any of those claims. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

As required by the Office Action, the title has been amended, and is believed to be clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claims 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because of an error in the language of Claim 6. Applicant has amended independent Claim 6 to delete the erroneous language, and believes that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated.

Claims 1-12 were rejected in the Office Action as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,032,718 (*Murakami*). Claims 11 and 12 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Murakami*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims. Applicant submits that amended independent Claims 1, 6, 11, and 12 together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art at least for the following reasons.

Amended Claim 1 is a photoelectric image input apparatus that includes a plurality of photoelectric conversion devices each of which includes a two-dimensional

array of photoelectric conversion areas. Claim 1 also includes light guide members that guide light to the two-dimensional array of the photoelectric conversion areas, wherein the light guide members include a connection member that connects the plurality of photoelectric conversion devices such that they are able to transmit electrical signals between the plurality of photoelectric conversion devices. Additionally, the light guide members are bonded to the two-dimensional array of photoelectric conversion areas using adhesives.

Murakami, as understood by Applicant, relates to a photo sensor array which includes a linear array of electrodes 4 which may be photoelectric conversion areas, and fiber bundles 5. However, nothing in *Murakami*, has been found to teach or suggest a plurality of photoelectric conversion devices, each of which includes a two-dimensional array of photoelectric conversion areas as now required by the amended claims.

Furthermore, *Murakami* fails to teach or suggest that an array of photoelectric conversion areas is bonded to the fiber bundles (light guide members) using adhesives. Contrastingly, *Murakami* teaches that the fibers are housed within a transparent substrate 1, (i.e., a glass plate of about 0.5 to 10 mm in thickness, col. 2, lines 32-33), and that the semiconductor layer (photoelectric conversion areas) is formed on the glass substrate using an rf plasma CVD method, a light excitation CVD method, a thermal CVD method, vapor deposition or sputtering technique. (Col. 3, Lines 26-33).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended Claim 1 is patentable over *Murakami* for at least the reasons indicated above. Likewise, amended independent Claims 6, includes the same features as Claim 1, namely that the photoelectric conversion devices include a two-dimensional array of photoelectric conversion areas, and the photoelectric

conversion areas are bonded to the light guide members using adhesive. Therefore, amended independent Claim 6 is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

Independent Claims 11 and 12 are system claims, that correspond to the apparatus Claims 1 and 6, respectively, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything that, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as applied against the independent claims, therefore, those claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record as well.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims, and are therefore submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 24613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 388148v1